

Amendments to the Drawing Figures:

The attached drawing sheets include proposed changes to FIGs. 1 and 2 and replace the original sheets including FIGs. 1 and 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 12-20 are newly added.

The applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. The claims are not narrowed in scope, and no new matter is added.

New dependent claims are added to at least partially restore the original range of claims that existed before multiple dependencies were removed in the preliminary amendment. No new matter is added.

The Office action objects to the Title; the Title is correspondingly amended.

The Office action objects to the drawings; corrected drawings are attached.

The Office action rejects claims 1-5, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Squires et al. (USPA 2004/0024502, hereinafter Squires). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Squires fails to teach an emergency lighting device that includes an illumination lamp for illuminating a surrounding area and an ultra-capacitor to power a lamp, as specifically claimed in claim 1, upon which claims 2-20 depend.

The Office action asserts that Squires' emergency lighting system includes the ultra-capacitor 1926. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Squires teaches a fire-fighting vehicle with an electric-drive, and clearly distinguishes between the vehicle accessory system (FIG. 2) and the vehicle traction system (FIG. 25). Squires teaches the use of ultra-capacitors to boost the horsepower in the traction system as needed:

"Applicants have determined that additional horsepower of short-term power can be provided into the AC power bus assembly 1942 over the phase conductors 1944 by discharge of an on-board capacitor or battery pack (energy storage device 1926) under control of the power storage unit 1922. (Squires [302]).

In FIG. 2, Squires illustrates emergency lighting devices 54a and 58a, and indicates that these devices 54a, 58a are powered by a power source 100. This power source 100 is remote from these lighting devices, and is not part of the vehicular traction system that includes the ultra-capacitors.

Squires does not teach that these emergency light devices 54a, 58a include a power source:

"The interface modules then distribute the power [from source 100] to the output devices 50, which are more specifically designated with the reference numbers 51a, 52a, 53a, 54a-c, 55a-c, 56a-b, 57a-c and 58a-d in FIG. 2." (Squires [0078].)

"In FIG. 2, the interface module 21 receives inputs from switches 41a that control the emergency lighting system of the fire truck. As previously noted, the emergency lighting system includes the flashing emergency lights (usually red and white) that are commonly associated with fire trucks and that are used to alert other motorists to the presence of the fire truck on the roadway or at the scene of a fire." (Squires [0087].)

As is clearly evident, Squires' emergency lighting device is a light that flashes when the fire truck is responding to an emergency. It is not a lighting device that has a power-source that powers a lamp to illuminate a surrounding area, and in particular, is not a lighting device that includes an ultra-capacitor to power the lamp, as specifically claimed by the applicants.

Further, Squires does not teach that the emergency lighting device includes a charging arrangement that is configured to charge the ultra-capacitor, as also claimed in claim 1. Squires' emergency lighting device does not include a charging arrangement.

Because Squires fails to teach an emergency lighting device that includes an ultra-capacitor that powers a lamp that illuminates an area, and because Squires fails to teach an emergency lighting system that includes a charging arrangement for charging an ultra-capacitor, as claimed by the applicants, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 1-5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Squires is unfounded, and should be reversed.

Also, with respect to the rejection of claims 2-4, Squires fails to teach a test unit that is configured to measure an impedance of the ultra-capacitor, as claimed in claim 2, upon which claims 2-4 and 12-18 depend.

The Office action asserts that Squires teaches a test unit that is configured to measure an impedance of the ultra-capacitor at paragraphs [0329]-[0330]. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Squires teaches a test circuit 215, but does not teach that this test circuit is configured to measure an impedance of the ultra-capacitor. Squires presents over 5 pages (pages 34-40) of detail regarding the function and capabilities of the testing system, and does not include a test of the impedance of the ultra-capacitor.

Because Squires Squires fails to teach a test unit that is configured to measure an impedance of the ultra-capacitor, as claimed in claim 2, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Squires is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

The Office action rejects:

claims 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Squires and Cho (USPA 2003/0099122); and

claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Squires, Cho, and Leonardi et al. (USPA 2005/0061561). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Each of claims 6-9 and 10 is dependent upon claim 1, and in this rejection, the Office action relies on Squires for teaching the elements of claim 1. As noted above, Squires fails to teach the elements of claim 1; accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejections of claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) that rely on Squires for teaching the elements of claim 1 is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001